

March 17, 1972 '■

TO: The Director,
Foreign Service Personnel Division,
United States Information Agency

SUBJECT: Record of Proceedings 71-31-USIA-F1:
Seiaedial Order in the Case of Grievant

REF: 3 FAM.667.2

{Grievant}, the Regional Technical Radio Officer (RTSO) attached to USIA in redacted, filed "a formal grievance charging that that portion of his efficiency report prepared by the post's former Deputy Public Affairs Officer (PAO) for the period July 1, 1970 through June 30, 1971, is falsely prejudicial and should be excised from his personnel records.

investigation of this grievance by the Board included an examination of the grievant's performance files and discussions with officials of CSIA familiar with both the case and the grievant.

The findings of this investigation indicated that the portion of the evaluation report in question was falsely prejudicial. Specifically, the Board noted that the grievant has had an excellent record and is highly regarded in his field of specialization. His performance file shows high ratings, and the criticisms leveled at him in the report in question—, that he was not interested in assisting or participating in regular CSIA programs; that he barely meets the required standards in his relations with others; and that he made no effort to become involved in *the* local community—are not contained in the two earlier reports submitted by the PAO and his predecessor. It is known, in this connection, that the grievant demonstrated just the opposite qualities while assigned to a previous post.

The Board further noted that despite the statement by the rating officer in the performance report that he was the grievant's "immediate supervisor", the grievant's normal immediate supervisor and rating officer in the past has been the PAO, not the deputy; that there is on file in USIA an Operations Memorandum of July 1971 from redacted stating that due to the absence of the PAO on home leave, the efficiency report in question was being sent to the former deputy PAO

at his new post for action; and that the rating officer, in a subsequent letter to the grievant, explaining his failure to discuss his criticisms with the grievant, stated: X had no idea that I would be responsible for writing part of your rating. If I had known, I assure you we would have discussed it prior to my departure... * The Board also took note of evidence showing that some personality differences were reflected in the rating officer's comments, and that these differences, in part at least, stemmed from the rating

and regional responsibilities.

The Board also noted that the rating officer's sharp criticisms of the grievant had not been, supported by any concrete examples. Additionally- the Board took into account that the rating officer made no allowance in his criticisms for the fact that the grievant had regional responsibilities requiring his absence from the post for some six months during the rating- period, and that his duties while at post required him to keep odd hours and to work at home.

On the basis of this finding, the Board herewith orders the excision. First the efficiency report in question of the ratings made by the former deputy PAO, and their replacement by a new rating to be prepared by the PAO. This new rating, moreover, should incorporate such comments on the pertinent aspects of the grievant's performance as can be obtained from the other posts in the regional area of the grievant's responsibility.

The Board further recommends that USSA consider the desirability of re-issuing a policy statement defining the relationship between the Regional Technical Radio Officer" and the Public Affairs Officers at their posts of assignment.

Your certification of compliance with the Board's order should be made within the next 30 days.

Willis E. Siakir. Chairman,
Foreign Service Grievance Board

CC: Grievant